

1
2 [Submitting counsel below]
3
4
5
6

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
OF NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

**IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT
LITIGATION**

No. 3:23-md-03084-CRB

**PLAINTIFF'S TRIAL BRIEF RE: MEDIA-
RELATED EVIDENCE**

This Document Relates to:

Jaylynn Dean v. Uber Techs., Inc.,
N.D. Cal. No. 23-cv-06708
D. Ariz. No. 25-cv-4276

Judge: Honorable Charles R. Breyer
Ctrm.: D. Ariz., 501

REDACTED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA
PHOENIX DIVISION

JAYLYNN DEAN,

No. 25-cv-4276-PHX-CRB

Plaintiff,

Judge: Honorable Charles R. Breyer
Ctrm.: 501

v.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

RESPONSE TO TRIAL BRIEF

2 At the pretrial conference, the Court indicated that evidence of Uber’s response to media
3 stories is admissible “to the extent it reflects a mindset or an attitude or an approach by the
4 defendant to these types of allegations or … to the subject matter.” 1/5/26 H’rg Tr. at 19:15-21.
5 Uber assured the Court that “context” would dispel any relevance of certain Slack communications
6 among Uber executives. The opposite is true. The full context confirms that the Court was right:
7 the statements at issue are highly probative of Uber’s mindset and approach to sexual assault in its
8 vehicles. In particular, the statements illustrate the company’s mindset at a crucial time—soon after
9 Uber announced “a period of widespread change at Uber”¹ and right when Uber was about to
10 partner with RAINN and release its first Safety Report, actions supposedly kicking off a new era
11 of victim-focused practices at the company. The statements also go directly to the credibility of
12 Uber’s executives, including one who will testify live in this trial. And, as the Court suggested, the
13 evidence may be accompanied by a limiting instruction.

I. Background

15 On October 9, 2019, USA Today reported that Uber had, without notice or consent, sent
16 victims' personal information to Crawford, a third-party claims company. Ex. A (article). The
17 article contrasted Uber's information-sharing with Crawford with its refusal to share information
18 with the police. The article highlighted how Crawford demanded non-disclosure agreements from
19 victims. And, the article included personal stories of women and even their family members being
20 contacted by Crawford in aggressive and misleading ways. *See id.* The story included comments
21 from Uber executive Andrew Hasbun, who only a few months later was promoted to Director of
22 Safety Communications. In particular, he defended Crawford's outreach to one victim as a response
23 to the victim's request "for financial support for therapy." *Id.* at 5-6.

24 Internally, Uber recognized how damaging the story was, not because of how victims were
25 treated, but because of how it would affect the company's reputation: ' [REDACTED]

²⁸ ||¹ Tony West, *Turning the lights on*, Uber (May 15, 2018), <https://www.uber.com/newsroom/turning-the-lights-on/>

1 [REDACTED]

2 [REDACTED] " Ex. B at 2036671. Enter Mr. Hasbun. He [REDACTED]

3 [REDACTED] *Id.* at 2036670.

4 In another conversation, however, Mr. Hasbun was more introspective. Slacking with a

5 fellow communications executive (a senior manager), he [REDACTED]

6 [REDACTED]

7 [REDACTED] Ex. C at 2096570. He complained that he "sold my soul" when he "trashed rape

8 victims to USA Today." *Id.* "Out of 3 [victims in the story], I trashed 2." *Id.* He "sliced their

9 credibility." *Id.* In particular, he [REDACTED]

10 [REDACTED]

11 [REDACTED] *Id.* And he derided Mr.

12 Fuldner, Uber's head of safety, as metaphorically having "the heads of various missing women" in

13 his "basement." *Id.*

14 **II. Argument**

15 What makes these Slack messages so probative is not their tone, but their candor. Speaking

16 privately, Mr. Hasbun acknowledged that Uber's public response required him to undermine

17 victims' credibility to protect senior safety executives. This evidence is relevant in exactly the way

18 the Court foresaw: it shows Uber's mindset in responding to sexual assault allegations. It does so

19 in the most candid, least sanitized way. And it shows that key fact at a crucial time: right when

20 Uber was about to partner with RAINN and release the first Safety Report, demonstrating the

21 predominant motivation behind those acts. The Court was right to deny Uber's motion in limine on

22 this point.

23 Uber's new arguments do not support exclusion of this evidence. *First*, Uber says that

24 Uber's reaction to the story "pertained only to Crawford's settlement-related conduct—not the

25 occurrence of assaults or the safety of the Uber platform." Trial Br. at 1. That's misdirection. Mr.

26 Hasbun's candid acknowledgements of how he approached the Crawford story demonstrates

27 Uber's attitude towards safety, i.e., its attitude towards "the occurrence of assaults or the safety of

28 the Uber platform." And Uber's work with Crawford itself, as Hasbun himself acknowledged, was

1 litigation management in the guise of providing “support” to victims. Ex. D at 1101511-12 (“[REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]
 3 [REDACTED]”).

4 *Second*, Uber says that Mr. Hasbun’s statements will “waste limited trial time litigating the
 5 details and veracity of claims made by two sexual assault survivors in 2019.” Trial Br. at 3. Not so.
 6 The details of those women’s stories are not important, nor are the details of the Crawford story in
 7 general. What matters is how Mr. Hasbun—who had license to speak on behalf of the company and
 8 was soon promoted to head of safety communications—understood Uber’s response to the
 9 allegations, and how he understood the veracity of Uber’s safety executives like Mr. Fuldner
 10 (whose credibility the jury must assess when he testifies live in this trial). In any event, Mr. Hasbun
 11 will testify only by deposition, so the Court will control exactly what testimony comes in and what
 12 does not on this topic.

13 *Third*, Uber complains that Mr. Hasbun’s comments are too inflammatory. But the reason
 14 Mr. Hasbun talked about “trash[ing] rape victims” is that he in fact trashed rape victims, and did so
 15 to “[REDACTED]” the “[REDACTED]” of Uber’s safety leaders and in service of Uber’s efforts to protect its
 16 reputation and promote its safety effort. The truth may be prejudicial, but only in the sense that
 17 “[r]elevant evidence is inherently prejudicial.” *United States v. Hankey*, 203 F.3d 1160, 1172 (9th
 18 Cir. 2000) (citation omitted). Rule 403 does not require that “facts [be] tailored and sanitized for
 19 the occasion.” *Id.*²

20 *Fourth*, Uber argues that “one employee’s outrageous comments … about a 2019 news
 21 story” have no connection to “the safety of the Uber platform in 2023 or Ms. Dean’s claims.” Trial
 22 Br. at 4. But Mr. Hasbun was not a random “employee,” but an important executive empowered to
 23

24 ² Uber cites *Aquino v. Cnty. of Monterey Sheriff’s Dep’t*, 2018 WL 3548867 (N.D. Cal. July 24,
 25 2018), but that case involved a (probably inadmissible hearsay) military reprimand letter containing
 26 “charged language” about the plaintiff’s character. *Id.* Here, the Hasbun comments are candid
 27 admissions of the defendant’s own conduct. Uber also cites *United States v. Williams*, 663 F. Supp.
 28 3d 1085 (D. Ariz. 2023), but that case involved a defendant’s rap lyrics and expert testimony
 explaining the limited probative value and extreme prejudicial effect in that the specific context.
Id. at 1102 (crediting testimony that “rap music generally and gangsta rap specifically ‘is a form of
 fiction’” and that “[p]eople have a strong negative, often visceral reaction to rap music that they do
 not have to any other fictional forms, even more violent or sexually explicit forms”). There is no
 comparison between Mr. Hasbun’s candid comments and a controversial art form.

1 speak for the company. And 2018-2020 was right when Uber will claim it left the “bad old days”
 2 behind and turned the page to a world of Safety Reports, non-profit partnerships, and safety
 3 features, all of which Uber will say was enough to avoid responsibility for the assault in this case.
 4 And Mr. Hasbun’s comments go directly to the credibility and state of mind of the very same
 5 executives (like Mr. Fuldner) running the company when Ms. Dean was assaulted. *See Ryder v.*
 6 *Westinghouse Elec. Corp.*, 128 F.3d 128, 133 (3d Cir. 1997) (admitting executive’s “ageist
 7 statements” in age discrimination case, even though “[t]hey were made approximately one year
 8 after the fact by individuals not involved in the decision” because “this evidence would make the
 9 existence of an improper motive for Ryder’s termination more probable”). The fact that Uber’s
 10 soon-to-be Director of Safety Communications thought that Uber’s Senior Vice President of Safety
 11 told “████████” concerning Uber’s safety issues is clearly and substantially probative in this trial.

12 Dated: January 9, 2026

13 Respectfully submitted,

14 By: /s/ Sarah R. London
 15 Sarah R. London (SBN 267083)

16 **GIRARD SHARP LLP**
 17 601 California St., Suite 1400
 18 San Francisco, CA 94108
 Telephone: (415) 981-4800
 slondon@girardsharp.com

19 By: /s/ Rachel B. Abrams
 20 Rachel B. Abrams (SBN 209316)

21 **PEIFFER WOLF CARR KANE**
CONWAY & WISE, LLP
 22 555 Montgomery Street, Suite 820
 23 San Francisco, CA 94111
 Telephone: (415) 426-5641
 Facsimile: (415) 840-9435
 rabrams@peifferwolf.com

24 By: /s/ Roopal P. Luhana

25
 26
 27
 28

1 Roopal P. Luhana

2
3
4
5
6
7 **CHAFFIN LUHANA LLP**
8 600 Third Avenue, 12th Floor
9 New York, NY 10016
10 Telephone: (888) 480-1123
11 Facsimile: (888) 499-1123
12 luhana@chaffinluhana.com

13 *Co-Lead Counsel*

14 **FILER'S ATTESTATION**

15 I am the ECF User whose ID and password are being used to file this document. In
16 compliance with N.D. Cal. L.R. 5-1(i)(3), I attest that the signatories above concurred in this filing.

17 Dated: January 9, 2026

18 By: /s/ Andrew R. Kaufman
19 Andrew R. Kaufman

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28